DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 364 107 FL 021 685

AUTHOR Hinkel, Eli
TITLE Pragmatics of Interaction: Expressing Thanks in a Second Language.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Arabic; *Attitudes; Chinese; College Students; Comparative Analysis; *Cultural Differences; *Cultural Traits; *English (Second Language); Higher Education; Indonesian; *Interpersonal Communication; Japanese; Korean; Native Speakers; *Pragmatics; Role Playing; Second Language Instruction; Spanish Speaking; Speech Acts; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *Politeness

ABSTRACT

This study investigated cultural differences in attitudes toward the speech act of giving thanks, particularly between native speakers and non-native speakers with extensive exposure to the second language culture. Subjects were 199 advanced speakers of English as a Second Language, enrolled at the college level in the United States. Their native languages included Chinese, Indonesian, Korean, Japanese, Spanish, and Arabic. The subjects participated in a role-playing exercise in which they were asked to respond to a specific interaction with an appropriate statement, using one of several choices provided. The 24 situations in the exercise were everyday events in which thanks might be appropriate. Results indicate differences between native language groups and native speakers of English in perception of the appropriateness of certain expressions of thanks. While there was concurrence within language groups, there was little between language groups. It is suggested that aspects of pragmatics, such as this one, are not always learned in natural interactive situations, but may need to be taught. A 30-item bibliography is included and the text of the role-playing exercise is appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 364 107

PRAGMATICS OF INTERACTION:

EXPRESSING THANKS IN A SECOND LANGUAGE[1]

Eli Hinkel

Xavier University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Eli Hinkel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

FL021685

ABSTRACT

Research into L2 learning has established that NNSs frequently rely on L1 cultural notions of appropriate behavior in their L2 interactions. Even though this pragmatic transfer can often lead to miscommunication, many commonly performed L2 speech acts are overlooked in language training curricula. A speech act as ubiquitous as expressing thanks is one example. Advanced non-native speakers may perceive the speech act of giving thanks as one of incurring indebtedness or asserting a reciprocal social relationship, as is often the case in their L1s, whereas native speakers of American English perceive it as neither. To investigate whether NNSs with an extensive exposure to L2 culture judge the appropriateness of speech acts of giving thanks in ways similar to those of NSs, a written role play was administered to 199 highly advanced NNSs. The results show that speakers of Chinese, Indonesian, Korean, Japanese, Spanish, and Arabic ranked expressions of thanks for appropriateness substantially differently than NSs. While there was a high concurrence about appropriate expressions of thanks within various language groups, there was almost no correspondence among the judgments of different language groups. One implication of this finding is that there may be few aspects of the acquisition of L2 pragmatics that can be excluded from a language training curriculum.

INTRODUCTION

Giving thanks is a speech act that is acquired at an early age (Becker & Smenner, 1986) and commonly performed (Coulmas, 1981). For this reason, it is often assumed that learners can successfully say *thank you* in a second language. Methodologies for teaching ESL frequently overlook the substantial cross-cultural differences associated with relatively "simple" aspects of L2 pragmatics, such as expressing thanks. One's ability to say *thank you* in a second language does not evince one's ability to recognize the situations when this speech act is appropriate or the extent to which thanks should be given according to the rules of politeness in an L2 community.

Yoon (1991) examined the usage of *thank you* in responses to compliments by monolingual speakers of American English and Korean, and bi-lingual speakers of both languages. The author's findings show that the bi-lingual subjects employed politeness strategies divergent from those of monolingual speakers of English or Korean. Eisenstein & Bodman (1986) have similarly determined that L1 socio-linguistic behaviors and L2 grammatical and lexical constraints affect learner production of appropriate pragmatic forms for expressing thanks in a second language.

This study proposes that there may be few aspects of the acquisition of L2 pragmatics that can be excluded from the language-training curriculum. The purpose of this study is to investigate whether advanced and trained non-native speakers (NNSs) with an extensive exposure to L2 culture judge the appropriateness of giving thanks in common situations similarly to native speakers (NSs) of English.

THE CROSS-CULTURAL PRAGMATICS OF GIVING THANKS

Apte (1974) notes that in many South Asian languages, verbalization of thanks and indebtedness are very closely interrelated, and saying *thank you* often entails an obligation not only for the speaker, but also for members of the speaker's kin. Similarly, Lebra (1976) indicates that the Japanese may be reluctant to express thanks verbally for fear of incurring indebtedness. In Japanese interactions, the cooperative conversational burden placed on the speaker is considerable as he or she

needs to take into account both his or her and the addressee's indebtedness.

Crane (1978) finds that Koreans have a similar cultural precept in which expressing thanks implies taking on obligations. The author also mentions that Koreans tend to be equally careful when accepting favors, promises, assurances, or material gifts. On the other hand, Korean expressions of thanks can also carry an element of a reciprocal social relationship, which is not the case in Japanese. Yang (1986) mentions that in Korean culture, social status determines how one expresses thanks. In his example, individuals with a high social position are not expected to give thanks as readily as those whose social status is lower.

As in Korean social frameworks, in Indonesian communities, the extent of linguistic politeness one must employ is inversely related to one's social status, refinement, power, and control, i.e. the higher one's social standing, the less linguistic politeness the person uses (Errington, 1984; Smith-Hefner, 1988). Because one's perceived social standing is often bound to self-identity, gender, and age, a very complex and elaborate system of tacit rules governs linguistic politeness and, therefore, the giving of thanks (Smith-Hefner, 1988).

In Chinese, expressing thanks occupies a comparatively low place in the hierarchy of politeness, and giving thanks does not entail indebtedness or social reciprocity (Lii-Shih, 1988). Unlike in Korean and Indonesian societies, in Chinese culture, the speaker's and the addressee's age is the primary factor in determining the degree of politeness the speaker employs, e.g. even classmates and friends who are older are treated with respect accorded to the age difference (Lii-Shih, 1988).

On the other hand, in some cultures, such as Arabic, giving thanks is utilized as means of establishing a closer social relationship: expressing thanks establishes social reciprocity and group belonging between the speaker and the addressee (El-Sayed, 1990). In fact, Arabic has a special expression to signal when indebtedness is incurred: if the speaker uses the expressions *l'azhli* or *al'asheni*, "for my sake," he or she indicates his or her indebtedness; in most situations, however, indebtedness is not incurred. The etiquette of social interactions requires

that offers and promises be made and thanks be given for these offers and promises. The purpose of such exchanges, however, lies in the manifestation of one's being accepted in a social group, rather than the actuality of the offers and the thanks expressed in response (El-Sayed, 1990; Nydell, 1987).

In Spanish-speaking cultures, norms of appropriateness in linguistic politeness differ strongly between males and females. Several experiments have demonstrated that these differences were so great that no correlation could be shown between male and female perceptions of appropriateness in politeness strategies in Spanish (Becker & Smenner, 1986; Divine, 1982). Devine (1982) found that among various Spanish-speaking groups, e.g. Venezuelan, Mexican, and Puerto Rican, males are expected to say more than is actually necessary in order to be polite. In expressing regrets and thanks, exaggeration is a common politeness strengthener used by both males and females to assure sincerity (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Yet, in other cultures, such as most English-speaking cultures, giving thanks rarely entails indebtedness or establishes social reciprocity. Thanks can be given regardless of whether the offer or promise is accepted or rejected and can be utilized as an acknowledgement (Hymes, 1971). In such non-debt-sensitive cultures, thanks can express gratitude, an intention to express gratitude, or fulfill a social expectation that gratitude be expressed (Hinkel, 1992).

Dialect variations even within English-speaking societies make for substantial differences in how thanks is used or given. Hymes (1971) notes that in British English, giving thanks is different from that in American English, with *thank you* frequently serving as a discourse marker or conversation sequencer, rather than an expression of gratitude. In neither American nor British English do the rules of politeness governing expressions of thanks generally include such considerations as indebtedness, social status and reciprocity, gender, or age.

THE STUDY

Subjects

All participants of the study were enrolled at the University and were actively pursuing studies toward their degrees. Of the 233 students, 98 were speakers of Chinese (CH), 33 of Indonesian (IN), 25 of Korean (KR), 15 each of Japanese (JP) and Spanish (SP), and 13 of Arabic (AR). There were 34 NSs included as a control group.

The NNSs represented a highly advanced group of language learners with a mean Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) score of 593. Their residence in the U.S. typically fell within the range of 1 to 5 years, with a mean of 3.7. It follows that all NNSs had had a relatively extensive exposure to L2 culture and appropriate L2 conversational routines.

Materials

Research in L2 learner perceptions of what represents appropriate communicative routines is limited to observations of conversations (Wolfson, 1986; Takahashi & Beebe, 1987) or collecting data obtained through various questionnaire formats. While discourse completion tests and open-ended instruments are frequently prone to problems associated with interpreting subjects' responses (Rose, 1992) and controlling for peripheral linguistic variables (Rintell & Mitchell, 1989), multiple-choice questionnaires, within limitations, have been proven to be a more effective measure of subjects' judgments of appropriateness (Bouton, 1989; Koike, 1989). This study is based upon written role plays (Takahashi & Beebe, 1987) in a multiple-choice format.

The situations for inclusion in the role-play questionnaire were based on Coulmas' (1981) taxonomy. Coulmas states that the verbalization of thanks is related to some action of a "benefactor" or to an outcome of some action that constitutes the object of thanks, material or immaterial. He cautions that this taxonomy is not definitive, and "other criteria are conceivable" (p. 75). He also stipulates that the distinctions between these classes are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

Coulmas' Taxonomy of Thanks by Class

1. thanks *ex ante* (for a promise, offer, invitation)
2. thanks *ex post* (for a favor, invitations (afterwards))
3. thanks for material goods (gifts, services)
4. thanks of immaterial goods (wishes compliments, congratulations, information)
5. thanks for some action initiated by the benefactor
6. thanks for some action resulting from a request/wish/order by the beneficiary
7. thanks that imply indebtedness[2]
8. thanks that do not imply indebtedness

The situations in this study were originally solicited from 7 NSs and 36 NNSs (Chinese, Indonesian, Korean, Japanese, Spanish, and Arabic). Of the 43 situations collected during the pilot study, 24 were selected to match Coulmas' taxonomy, three per each class. (See Appendix for the questionnaire situations.) The remaining 21 were considered situationally redundant, e.g. 5 suggestions involved an offer of a soft drink and 3 an invitation to a party.

Procedure

A peer acquaintance was briefly outlined in the questionnaire:

When you are responding to the questions, please keep in mind the following imaginary student: K.C. is a student in your department. You have similar interests in your majors. You have talked to K.C. several times in the department lounge.

Each item in the questionnaire adhered to the same format: a situation was briefly described; following the situation, three multiple-choice selections were presented. One of the choices contained two expressions of thanks, one contained one expression, and the other no expression of thanks. For example,

(1) K.C. asks you if you would like a soft drink. You can say to K.C.:

(A) Thanks. I like this drink.

(B) Thanks. I like this drink. Thank you very much.

(C) I like this drink.

(2) *K.C. invites you to a party. After the party, you can say to K.C.:*

(A) I am glad I came to the party.

(B) Thanks. I am glad I came to the party.

(C) Thanks. I am glad I came to the party. Thank you very much.

When responding to the questionnaire, the subjects were asked to rank the multiple-choice selections. The response which, in their opinion, best fit the situation was marked 1; the second best selection was marked 2, and the least appropriate 3.

The 24 situations presented to the study participants dealt with everyday events, such as dropping one's glove or carrying packages to the post office. As has been mentioned, the questionnaire contained 3 situations per each class in Coulmas' taxonomy. In order to circumvent the issue of the respondents' possible confusion when performing the required task, responses to the first situation in each class were considered invalid and excluded from data analysis.

To make the instrument less prone to cultural bias (Wolfson, 1989), situations were solicited from NNSs and two situations per class were included. Furthermore, if the two responses per class differed, their rankings were averaged. In the situations and the accompanying possible responses, all references to gender, age, nationality, and native language were avoided; no pronouns, except the first person singular and second person singular were used. The vocabulary utilized in the questionnaire design was limited to high frequency words so as not to impede the task.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The subjects' rankings of the responses with no expression of thanks and with two expressions of thanks, as outlined in the questionnaire, were compiled independently for each class in Coulmas' (1981) taxonomy. In the discussion below, these are termed responses with zero thanks and responses with two thanks.

Then the rankings for the two situations per class for each NNSs group were averaged, and the average values were compared. For example, in the situations with thanks *ex ante* (class 1), the ranking for the selection with zero thanks for NSs was 2.43, Indonesians 1.97, Japanese 2.24, Chinese 2.59, Spanish 2.73, Korean 2.87, and Arabic 2.98.

Relative to the other average values for this item, the Indonesian value is clearly the lowest, i.e. more Indonesians than participants in any other group viewed the response with zero thanks as appropriate in thanks *ex ante* situations. Based on these values, Indonesian responses were assigned the rank of 1, Japanese 2, NSs 3, Chinese 4, Spanish 5, Korean 6, and Arabic 7. Averages were similarly ranked for the remaining 7 classes.

To determine the consistency of rankings between each of the subject groups, Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance *(W)* was computed for expressions with zero thanks in classes 1-8; the same procedure was repeated for expressions with two thanks (see Table 1). When the value of *W* equals 1.00, it indicates perfect concordance (or consistency) of rankings between the language groups. As *W* approaches 0, the responses approach randomness. X^2 values were used to determine the significance of *W* coefficients (Table 1).

Table 1

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (N = 233)

Rank Orderings of Responses with Zero-thanks

Class	NSs (k=34)	CH (k=98)	IN (k=33)	KR (k=25)	JP (k=15)	SP (k=15)	AR (k=13)
1	3	4	1	6	2	5	7
2	3	2	1	4	5	6	7
3	5	4	2	3	1	6	7
4	5	3	1	2	4	6	7
5	5	4	1	2	3	7	6
6	4	3	2	5	1	6	7
7	4	3	1	2	5	6	7
8	4	3	2	5	1	6	7

$W = .973$ $\chi^2 = 46.704$ $p < .001$

Rank Orderings of Responses with Two Thanks

Class No.	NSs (k=34)	CH (k=98)	IN (k=33)	KR (k=25)	JP (k=15)	SP (k=15)	AR (k=13)
1	7	4	6	2	5	3	1
2	6	4	7	2	5	3	1
3	4	3	7	5	6	2	1
4	4.5	4.5	6	3	7	2	1
5	4.5	4.5	7	3	6	2	1
6	2.5	2.5	6	4	5	7	1
7	4.5	4.5	7	3	6	2	1
8	4.5	4.5	6	3	7	2	1

$W = .762$ $\chi^2 = 36.576$ $p < .001$

The coefficients of concordance for both zero-thanks and two thanks were very high (W = .973 ($p < .001$) and W = .762 ($p < .001$) respectively) indicating a strong positive correlation and a high degree of consistency in the subjects' judgment of politeness within different native language groups.

Table 2

Rank Correlation Coefficients (T) for Responses with Zero-thanks

	NSs	CH	IN	KR	JP	SP	AR
NSs	1.00	.29	-.21	-.46	.11	.29	.54
CH		1.00	.18	-.21	-.11	-.11	-.25
IN			1.00	.29	.18	.21	.36
KR				1.00	-.25	-.04	-.07
JP					1.00	-.29	-.14
SP						1.00	.39
AR							1.00

Table 3

Rank Correlation Coefficients (T) for Responses with Two Thanks

	NSs	CH	IN	KR	JP	SP	AR
NSs	1.00	.68	.54	.36	.18	.11	-.04
CH		1.00	.50	-.36	-.11	.54	.32
IN			1.00	.29	.29	.11	.54
KR				1.00	.36	.46	.07
JP					1.00	.07	.07
SP						1.00	.32
AR							1.00

Table 2 presents Rank Correlation Coefficients (T) for subject's responses with zero thanks, and Table 4 shows this correlation for responses with two thanks. As with Kendall's W, when the value of T equals 1, it indicates a perfect correlation between the rankings of two groups of subjects. When the value equals -1, it reflects a perfectly inverse relationship between two variables.

In Tables 2 and 3, the T coefficients not contained in the matrix diagonal are less than the critical value (.64) (p = .05) for a two-sided test. With the exception of the coefficient between the rankings between Chinese and NSs (Table 3), the T values demonstrate that there is no real relationship between the responses of various language groups. Keeping in mind the noticeable L1 cultural differences that exist in the rules for appropriate expressions of thanks among the subject groups, these findings come as little surprise.

As has been mentioned, in neither Chinese nor English does giving thanks entail indebtedness or social reciprocity. The significant correlation (T = .68 (p = .05)) between the rankings of the Chinese and NSs for responses with two thanks may reflect similarities between the NSs' and the Chinese subjects' perceptions of appropriateness associated with giving thanks. The absence of significant correlation between the T coefficients for all groups of subjects can be explained by several processes affecting the acquisition of L2 pragmatic notions and politeness. The issue of learner competence and performance represents one of the key issues in adult L2 acquisition. Blum-Kulka (1982, 1983) advanced a hypothesis of L2 pragmatic interlanguage in which learners employ speech acts inappropriate in both L1 and L2. Her premise is based on the notion that learners develop a non-language-specific pragmatic competence employed in the production of L2 speech acts. In her view, learners draw on their pragmatic competence and knowledge of L1 speech acts, rules of politeness, and grammar in L2 interactions; if equivalent structures do not exist in L2, learners produce inappropriate L2 pragmatic forms.

Although thanks is expressed in many languages, its situational and pragmatic appropriateness differ among cultures. The high and significant values for

consistency between group rankings testify that the subjects in the native language groups made similar judgments of politeness. Therefore, Blum-Kulka's (1982) pragmatic interlanguage hypothesis does not appear to hold true in the case of expressing thanks in L2. Because no real correlation was established between their L2 behaviors, it is plausible that subjects transferred their L1 pragmatic competence to L2, rather than exhibited developmental behaviors.

Some studies point to the possibility that exposure to L2 culture and its pragmatic norms is not always synonymous with experience in it and/or the learning of it. Ioup (1989) and Adamson & Regan (1991) provide considerable evidence that Asian immigrants who have resided in the U.S. for lengths of time in excess of ten years frequently fail to acquire the socio-pragmatic norms of their English-speaking communities.

The acquisition of L1 rules of politeness associated with thanks begins approximately at the age of two when mothers start urging their children to say *thank you* (Bates, 1981). While learners may develop conceptualizations and cognition of L2 pragmatic rules of expressing thanks, their perceptions of the degree of politeness appear to draw on L1 rules of politeness acquired at a very early age.

CONCLUSIONS

This study establishes that in written role-plays, 199 highly advanced and trained speakers of Chinese, Indonesian, Korean, Japanese, Spanish, and Arabic ranked expressions of thanks for appropriateness substantially differently than the NS control group. While between-group values for Kendall's Coefficients of Concordance W for expressions with zero and high thanks were high and significant, the values for T rank correlation coefficients showed no real relationship between the rankings of subjects with different native language backgrounds, i.e. there was a great deal of consistency in the rankings of appropriate expressions of thanks within subject groups, but almost no correlation between the rankings given by different groups. This finding is consistent with that of Scarcella (1979) who determined that although

L2 rapport-building strategies can be acquired in natural interactive situations, in general, socio-pragmatic appropriateness has to be taught.

NOTES

[1]An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the Sixth International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1992.

[2]While both NSs and NNSs were requested to submit situations to match Coulmas' (1981) taxonomy, NSs had difficulty with those in which giving thanks implied indebtedness. In fact, several NSs commented that the actual giving of thanks did not entail indebtedness, but rather, the benefactor's actions did.

REFERENCES

Adamson, H. & V. Regan. (1991). The acquisition of community speech norms by Asian immigrants learning English as a second language: A preliminary study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 1-22.

Apte, M.L. (1974). 'Thank you' and South Asian languages: a comparative sociolinguistic study. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 3*, 67-89.

Bates, E. (1981). *Language and context: The acquisition of pragmatics.* New York: Academic Press.

Becker, J. & P. Smenner. (1986). The spontaneous use of *thank you* by preschoolers as a function of sex, socioeconomic status, and listener status. *Language in Society, 15(4)*, 537-546.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning to say what you mean in a second language: A study of speech act performance of Hebrew second language learners. *Applied Linguistics, 3*, 29-59.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1983). Interpreting and performing speech acts in a second language: A cross-cultural study of Hebrew and English. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.),

Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Bouton, L. (1989). So they got the message, but how did they get it? *IDEAL, 4,* 119-148.

Brown, P & S. Levinson. (1987). *Politeness.* Reprinted. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coulmas, F. (1981). Poison to your soul. Thanks and apologies contrastively viewed. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and pre-patterned speech.* The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Crane, P. (1978). *Korean patterns.* Seoul, Korea: Kwangjin Publishing.

Devine, J. (1982). A question of universality: Conversational principles and implications. In M. Clarke & J. Handscombe (Eds.), *On TESOL '82: Pacific perspectives on language learning and teaching.* Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Eisenstein, M. & J. Bodman. (1986). "I very appreciate": Expressions of gratitude by native and nonnative speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics, 7,* 167-185.

El-Sayed, Ali. (1990). Politeness formulas in English and Arabic: A contrastive study. *ITL., 89-90,* 1-23.

Errington, J. (1984). Self and self-conduct among the Javanese *priyayi* elite. *American Ethnologist, 11(2),* 275-290.

Hinkel, E. (1992). Appropriateness in L2 conversations: Function and form. Paper presented at NAFSA 44th Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.

Hymes, D. (1971). Sociolinguistics and the ethnography of speaking. In E. Ardner (Ed.), *Social anthropology and language.* London: Tavistock Publications.

Ioup, G. (1989). Immigrant children who have failed to acquire native English. In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Variation in second language acquisition (vol. 2).* Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Koike, D. (1989). Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: Speech acts in interlanguage. *Modern Language Journal, 73(3),* 279-289.

Lebra, T. (1976). *Japanese behavior patterns.* Honolulu: The University Press of

Hawaii.

Lii-Shih, Y. (1988). *Conversational politeness and foreign language teaching.* Taipei, Taiwan: Crane Publishing.

Nydell, M. (1987). *Understanding Arabs.* Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.

Scarcella, R. (1979). On speaking politely in a second language. In C. Yorio, K. Perkins, & J. Schachter (Eds.), *On TESOL '79: The learner in focus* (pp. 275-87). Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Rintell, E, & C. Mitchell. (1989). Studying requests and apologies: An inquiry into method. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 155-73). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing.

Rose, K. (1992). Speech acts and questionnaires: The effect of hearer response. *Journal of Pragmatics, 17,* 49-62.

Smith-Hefner, N. (1988). Women and politeness: The Javanese example. *Language in Society, 17(4),* 535-554.

Takahashi, T, & L. Beebe. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT, 8,* 131-55.

Wolfson, N. (1986). Research methodology and the question of validity. *TESOL Quarterly, 20,* 689-99.

Wolfson, N. (1989). Problems in the comparison of speech acts across cultures. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 174-86). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing.

Yang, W. (1986). *Korean ways, Korean mind.* Seoul: Tamgu Dang Publishing.

Yoon, K. (1991). Bilingual pragmatic transfer to speech acts: Bi-directional responses to a compliment. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning (Vol. 2).* Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois.

APPENDIX

The Questionnaire

1. K.C. invites you to a party. You accept. You can say to K.C.:

   (A) I'll be glad to come to the party.

   (B) Thanks. I'll be glad to come to the party. Thank you very much.

   (C) Thanks. I'll be glad to come to the party.

2. You left your calculator at home, and you need to finish your assignment. You ask K.C. to let you use the one K.C. has. K.C. gives you the calculator. When you return it, you can say to K.C.:

   (A) Thanks. I finished my assignment.

   (B) Thanks. I finished my assignment. Thank you very much.

   (C) I finished my assignment.

3. You are planning on taking a course which K.C. has already taken. You ask K.C. about the course. K.C. tells you about it. You can say to K.C.:

   (A) Thanks. I am thinking about taking this course.

   (B) I am thinking about taking this course.

   (C) Thanks. I am thinking about taking this course. Thank you very much.

4. Usually, you walk home. Today, the rain is pouring down, and you do not have an umbrella. K.C. drives home in the direction of your house, and today, because of the rain, K.C. is driving you home. You can say to K.C.:

   (A) I am glad I didn't have to walk home today.

   (B) Thanks. I am glad I didn't have to walk home today. Thank you very much.

   (C) Thanks. The rain is really coming down.

5. You and K.C. are walking to class. You drop your glove and do not notice it. K.C. picks it up and gives it to you. You can say to K.C.:

   (A) Thanks. I did not even notice I dropped that glove.

   (B) Thanks. I did not even notice I dropped that glove. Thank you very much.

(C) I did not even notice I dropped that glove.

6. You are going home for the break between quarters. K.C. wishes you a safe trip and a nice break. You can say to K.C.:

(A) Thanks. I am looking forward to going home. Thank you very much.

(B) I am looking forward to going home.

(C) Thanks. I am looking forward to going home.

7. You are carrying several large packages to the post office. You are struggling and walking very slowly. K.C. helps you carry them. When you come to the post office, you can say to K.C.:

(A) Thanks. I can manage from here. Thank you very much.

(B) Thanks. I can manage from here.

(C) I can manage from here.

8. You are typing a paper in the computer lab, and you are having a hard time getting your printer to work. K.C. gets it to work. You can say to K.C.:

(A) Thanks. I can print my paper now.

(B) I can print my paper now.

(C) Thanks. I can print my paper now. Thank you very much.

9. You need to write down some information. You do not have a pen. K.C. hands you one. After you finish writing, you can say to K.C.:

(A) A pen is just what I needed.

(B) Thanks. A pen is just what I needed. Thank you very much.

(C) Thanks. A pen is just what I needed.

10. You have just received a letter of acceptance to Harvard University. K.C. congratulates you. You can say to K.C.:

(A) Thanks. I am very happy. Thank you very much.

(B) I am very happy.

(C) Thanks. I am very happy.

11. You are very busy. It's lunch time. You are hungry but you do not have time to get food. K.C. offers to bring you a sandwich from the cafeteria. You accept.

You can say to K.C.:

(A) I am starving.

(B) Thanks. I am starving.

(C) Thanks. I am starving. Thank you very much.

12. K.C. asks you if you would like a soft drink. You accept. You can say to K.C.:

(A) Thanks. I like this drink.

(B) Thanks. I like this drink. Thank you very much.

(C) I like this drink.

13. You are moving to a new apartment, and K.C. helps carry some things. You can say to K.C.:

(A) Thanks. I couldn't move this alone. Thank you very much.

(B) I couldn't move this alone.

(C) Thanks. I couldn't move this alone.

14. You are in the university bookstore trying to find some books which you need for your course. K.C. shows you where the books are located. You can say to K.C.:

(A) Thanks. I didn't know where to look.

(B) Thanks. I didn't know where to look. Thank you very much.

(C) I didn't know where to look.

15. You need to go to the other end of the city to take a test (TOEFL, SAT, or GRE). K.C. knows the city very well. You ask K.C. for the road directions, and K.C. explains the route to you. You can say to K.C.:

(A) Thanks. I've never been to that part of the city. Thank you very much.

(B) Thanks. I've never been to that part of the city.

(C) I've never been to that part of the city.

16. You dropped your papers and notes, which spilled in the middle of a busy sidewalk. K.C. is walking by. K.C. stops and helps you pick up your papers. You can say to K.C.:

(A) Thanks. I can't believe I dropped my papers.

(B) I can't believe I dropped my papers.

(C) Thanks. I can't believe I dropped my papers. Thank you very much.

17. K.C. gives you a ride that takes about about 15 minutes. When you arrive, you can say to K.C.:

(A) It didn't take very long.

(B) Thanks. It didn't take very long. Thank you very much.

(C) Thanks. It didn't take very long.

18. You ask K.C. to help you fill out the health insurance form. K.C. is glad to do it. You can say to K.C.:

(A) Thanks. These forms are hard to fill out.

(B) These forms are hard to fill out.

(C) Thanks. These forms are hard to fill out. Thank you very much.

19. K.C. invites you to a party. After the party, you can say to K.C.:

(A) I am glad I came to the party.

(B) Thanks. I am glad I came to the party.

(C) Thanks. I am glad I came to the party. Thank you very much.

20. Your paper is due in 30 minutes. You still have to finish typing it, and it looks like you may not be done on time. K.C. helps you with the typing. You can say to K.C.:

(A) It's almost done.

(B) Thanks. It's almost done.

(C) Thanks. It's almost done. Thank you very much.

21. K.C. offers to go with you to the department office to help you with some of the procedures for registration. You can say to K.C.:

(A) Thanks. These registration procedures are confusing.

(B) These registration procedures are confusing.

(C) Thanks. These registration procedures are confusing. Thank you very much.

22. You need to use a book which K.C. has. K.C. offers to lend it to you for a few days. You can say to K.C.:

(A) Thanks. I need it. Thank you very much.

(B) I need it.

(C) Thanks. I need it.

23. K.C. asks you if you would like an apple. You accept. You can say to K.C.:

(A) Thanks. I like apples. Thank you very much.

(B) Thanks. I like apples.

(C) I like apples.

24. You left your wallet at home and have no money for lunch. K.C. loans you $5. You can say to K.C.:

(A) Thanks. I'll pay you back tomorrow.

(B) Thanks. I'll pay you back tomorrow. Thank you very much.

(C) I'll pay you back tomorrow.